



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

87

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,881	03/24/2004	Kevin M. Somervill	200209193-1	6631
22879	7590	03/10/2006	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			RAY, GOPAL C	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2111		

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/808,881	SOMERVILL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gopal C. Ray	2111	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

1. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.
2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The examiner believes that the title of the invention is broad. A descriptive title indicative of the invention will help in proper indexing, classifying, searching, etc. See MPEP 606.01. However, the title of the invention should be limited to 500 characters.
3. The drawings filed on 3/24/04 are acceptable by the examiner. However, direct any inquiries concerning drawing review by the USPTO draftsperson to the Drawing Review Branch at (703) 305-8404.
4. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification. Furthermore, all claims should be revised carefully to eliminate all grammatical errors and antecedent basis problems.
5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
6. Claims 1, 5-10, 15 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,101,565 granted to Nishtala et al.

As per claim 1, the reference of Nishtala et al. teaches, "a first bus, a second bus, a third bus" in Fig. 2, elements D1-D7; "a multiplexing module coupled with said first bus, said second bus, and said third bus and for selectively coupling said first bus with said second bus or said third bus" in Fig. 2, element 95; "a configuration module

coupled with said multiplexing module and for controlling operation of said multiplexing module” in Fig. 2, element 75.

As per claim 5, the reference of Nishtala et al. teaches, “wherein said multiplexing module comprises electrical circuitry” in Fig. 2, element 95.

As per claim 6, the reference of Nishtala et al. inherently teaches the added limitations in col. 3, lines 48-59.

As per claim 7, the reference of Nishtala et al. teaches, “wherein said configuration module comprises a register” in Fig. 2, elements R1-R7.

As per claim 8, the reference of Nishtala et al. teaches, “wherein said configuration module comprises a switch” in col. 7, line 46 (switching unit).

As per claim 9, the reference of Nishtala et al. teaches, “transmitting a first control signal to a configuration module” in Fig. 2, “DataPath Control” signal; “causing a multiplexing module to couple a first bus with a second bus of said computing device, in response to said first control signal” in Fig. 2, element 95.

As per claim 10, the reference of Nishtala et al. inherently teaches the added limitation in the claim in Fig. 2, element 96 and col. 3, lines 48-59.

As per claim 15, the claim is rejected for similar reasons as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 with the exception of “a first I/O bus”. However, the reference of Nishtala et al. teaches, “a first I/O bus” in Fig. 2, element D6.

As per claim 19, the reference of Nishtala et al. inherently teaches the added limitations in col. 3, lines 48-59.

As per claim 20, the reference of Nishtala et al. teaches, "wherein said configuration module comprises a register" in Fig. 2, elements R1-R7.

As per claim 21, the reference of Nishtala et al. teaches, "wherein said configuration module comprises a switch" in col. 7, line 46 (switching unit).

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-4, 11-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,101,565 granted to Nishtala et al. in view of common knowledge in the data processing art.

As per claims 2-4, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 with the exception of added limitation(s) in each claim such as "first/second controller adapter chips coupled with second/third buses" as claimed in claim 2, etc. The examiner takes Official Notice that the added features claimed in claims 2-4 are within the skill of an ordinary person in the data processing art at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Nishtala et al. to implement the above features to obtain the claimed invention as claimed in claims 2-4 because these are straightforward possibilities in the data processing art from which one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would select in accordance with various

circumstances without the exercise of inventive skill in order to allow the system of Nishtala et al. to be compatible with a widely used standard and to allow the system to take advantage of the many benefits provided by those features.

As per claims 11-14, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in the rejection of claim 9 with the exception of added limitation(s) in each claim such as "causing a controller adapter chip coupled with said second bus to go off line as claimed in claim 2, etc. The examiner takes Official Notice that the added features claimed in claims 11-14 are within the skill of an ordinary person in the data processing art at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Nishtala et al. to implement the above features to obtain the claimed invention as claimed in claims 11-14 because these are straightforward possibilities from which one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would select in accordance with various circumstances without the exercise of inventive skill in order to allow the system of Nishtala et al. to be compatible with a widely used standard and to allow the system to take advantage of the many benefits provided by those features.

As per claims 16-18, the claims are rejected for similar reasons as discussed in the rejection of claims 2-4 respectively.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is urged to consider the references. However, the references should be evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure.

If applicants are aware of any prior art better than those are of record, they are required to bring the prior art to the attention of the examiner. Applicants are also reminded that each individual associated with the filing and prosecution of a patent application has a duty of candor and good faith in dealing with the Office, which includes a duty to disclose to the Office all information known to that individual to be material to patentability as defined in 37 CFR 1.56. Applicants are advised to submit any information material to patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gopal C. Ray whose telephone number is (571) 272-3631. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart, can be reached on (571) 272-3632. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [\[mark.rinehart@uspto.gov\]](mailto:mark.rinehart@uspto.gov).

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to TC central telephone number is (571) 272-2100. Moreover, information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lastly, paper copies of cited U.S. Patents and Patent Application Publications ceased to be mailed to applicants with office actions as of June 2004. Paper copies of Foreign Patents and Non-Patent Literature will continue to be included with office actions. These cited U.S. Patents and Patent Application Publications are available for download via Office's PAIR. As an alternate source, all U.S. Patents and Patent Application Publications are available on the USPTO web site (www.uspto.gov), from the office of Public Records and from commercial sources. Applicants are referred to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html> or 1-866-217-9197 for information on this policy. Requests to restart a period for response due to a missing U.S. Patent or Patent Application Publications will not be granted.

Gopal C. Ray
GOPAL C. RAY
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2300